

THE  
RELIGION  
OF  
Mar. Luther

NEITHER  
CATHOLICK  
NOR  
PROTESTANT,

*Prov'd from his own Works.*

---

*With some REFLECTIONS*

In ANSWER to the Vindication of *Mar. Luther's Spirit*, Printed at the *Theater* in *Oxon*. His *Vindication* being another Argument of the *Schism* of the Church of *England*.

---

[*Thomas Deane*]

O X O N.

Printed by *Henry Cruttenden*, One of His Majesty's  
Printers. MDCLXXXVIII.





## The Religion of M. LUTHER neither Catholick nor Protestant, Prov'd from his own Writings.

### I. LUTHER's Religion not Catholick, in Eight Instances.

*Inst. 1.* **B**Egin we first with his impious Doctrine concerning the *Blessed Trinity*, of which he thus speaks, *The Divinity is threefold, as the three Persons are, &c.* And from hence the reason may well be, why *Luther* expunges out of the Litany this Verse, *Holy Trinity, one very God, have mercy on us.* And hereupon he is not afraid to say, that the word *Trinity* is but an *Human Invention*, and sounds coldly. And then further adds, that his Soul hates the word *Homouſion*, or *Consubstantial*; for thus he writes, *Anima mea odit Homouſion, & optime exigerunt Ariani, ne vocem illam prophanam & novam regulis fidei statuiliceret.* My very Soul hates the word *Homouſion*, [ or *Consubstantial*, ] and the *Arians*, not without reason, requir'd, that it should not be lawful to put this prophane and new Word among the Rules of Faith. *Luther's* Blasphemy against the *B. Trinity* was such, and so odious, that even *Zuinglius* did purposely write against *Luther* about this very point. [ So relates *Zuing.* of *Luth.* tom. 2. in resp. ad confut. *Luth.* fol. 474. *Luth.* in *Ench. præcum* ann. 1543. *Luth.* in *postil. majori Basilicæ apud Hervagium in Enarrat. Evang. Dom. Trin.* Contra *Jaobum Latomum*, tom. 2. *Wittemb. latine edit* ann. 1551. *Zuing.* tom. 2. in respons. ad Confess. *Luth.* ]

*Inst. 2.* Concerning the event of things, *Luther* holds,  
A 2 That

*That all things come to pass through a certain Stoical and Fatal necessity ; for he defending this Heresie, thus writes, Nullius est in manu, &c. It is in no man's power to think good or evil ; but all things ( as Wickliff's Article, condemn'd at Constance, did rightly teach ) proceed from absolute Necessity. And again, fateor articulum &c. I do confess Wickliff's Article, of all things coming to pass by Necessity, to have been falsely condemn'd in the Conventicle of Constance. [ In assert. damnat. per Leonem, art. 36. Luth. de servo arbitrio c. 32. ]*

*Inst 3. To the dishonour of Christ's Passion, and also to the Merit of his Redemption, he teaches, that Christ not only suffer'd in Body, but likewise his Divinity suffer'd too ; for thus he writes, Cum credo, quod sola humana Natura pro me passa est, Christus vilis, nec magni pretii salvator est, &c. If I believe, that only the Human Nature of Christ suffer'd for me, then is Christ a Saviour but of a base and small worth ; and himself needeth a Saviour. And Luther speaking of this point in another place, thus reprehends the Zuinglians ; The Zuinglians did contend against me most pertinaciously, that the Divinity of Christ could not suffer. A Doctrine so Blasphemous, as that it was refuted not only by the Zuinglians in Luther's days, but even by Beza too. [ Luth. in Conf. Majore in Cæna Domini. Vide In Concil. part. 2. Ep. Theol. c. epist. 60. ]*

*Inst. 4. Concerning the Administration of the Word and Sacraments, Luther teaches, that all men ( and women also ) have authority and power to administer. These are his own words, The first Office of a Priest is to preach the Word, &c. But this is common to all : Next, to baptize ; and this also all may do, even women, &c. The third Office is to Consecrate Bread and Wine : But this also is common to all, no less than Priests ; And this I avouch by the Authority of Christ himself saying, Do this in remembrance of me : Christ speaking to all then present, and to come afterwards. If that then which is greatest of all is given indifferently to all Men and Women ( I mean the word and Baptism, ) then that*  
which



[ 5 ]

which is less ( I mean to consecrate the Supper ) is also given to them. Thus Luther. Nay, Luther proceeded so far herein, that ( as Dr. Covel witnesses, in his Defence of Mr. Hooker, art. 15. p. 101. ) he was not afraid to affirm, that the Sacraments were effectual, tho administered by Satan himself. With Dr. Covel agrees the Protestant Hospinian, thus writing, *Lutherus eo usque progreditur, &c. Luther proceeds so far herein, that he maintains the Sacrament to be a true Sacrament, etiamsi a Diabolo conficeretur, tho it were to be Consecrated by the Devil.* [ *Luth. tom. 2. lib. de Min. Eccl. instit. fol. 368, 369. Vide lib. de abrog. Missa privata, tom. 2. fol. 249. & lib. de captivit. Babilon. c. de ordine. In hist. Sacr. par. altera fol. 14.* ]

*Inst. 5.* For absolute denial of Temporal Magistrates ( an Heresie indifferently condemn'd both by Catholicks and Protestants ) we find Luther thus to write, *Among Christians no man can, or ought to be a Magistrate; But every one is to other equally subject, &c.* And again, *As Christ cannot suffer himself to be tyed and bound by Laws, &c. So also ought not the Conscience of a Christian to suffer them.* [ *Luth. de seculari potest. in tom. 6. Germ. Luth. in tom. 7. Wittenb. fol. 327.* ]

*Inst. 6.* Concerning Luther's denial of certain Books of Scripture. And first, the *Epistle of St. James* is call'd by Luther, *Contentious, swelling, strawy, and unworthy an Apostolical Spirit.* The Book of the *Apocalyps* is also rejected by Luther, by the acknowledgment of Bullinger, for which he says good and learned Men were offended with him. I will add Luther's contempt of *Moses*, and some of the Apostles: against *Moses* he thus writes, *Habuit Moyses infecunda labia, irata, &c.* And again, *Moyses habuit labia diffusa felle & ira.* Of *St. Peter* he says, *St. Peter did live, and teach, extra Verbum Dei, contrary to the Word of God.* [ *Luth. præfat. in Jac. edit. 4. Ienensi. Tom. 3. Wittenberg. in psal. 45. fol. 423. In ep. ad Gal. c. 1. tom. 5 Wittenb. ann. 1554. fol. 290.* ]

*Inst.*

*Inst. 7. Luther also taught an Heresie whereby the Propagation of Christian Religion is much endanger'd; to wit, That it was not lawful to wage War against the Turks; his words are these, Præliari contra Turcas, est repugnare Deo visitanti iniquitates nostras per illos. To wage War against the Turks, is to resist God visiting our sins by them. Of which Erasmus thus writes, Many of the Saxons following herein that first Doctrine of Luther, deny'd to Cæsar and K. Ferdinand Aid against the Turks, &c. declaring, they had rather fight for a Turk not Baptized, than for a Turk Baptized. [ Luth. in tom. 2. Witt. In assert. damnat. per Leonem decimum assert. 34. In ep. ad fratres Inferioris Germaniæ. ]*

*Inst. 8. Concerning Faith and good Works, Luther taught an Heresie disallow'd by all learned Protestants. He says, It is impiety to affirm, that Faith without Charity justifies not. Nay he adds further, Fides nisi sit sine, &c. Except Faith be without the least good Works, it doth not justifie; nay it is not Faith. And lastly, the more to debase good works, he thus saith, Works take their goodness of the Worker; and no Work is disallow'd of God, unless the Author be disallow'd before. [ Luth. upon Gal. English'd, in c. 2. Luth. tom. 1. prop. 3. Luth. Serm. Engl. 204. &c. ]*

## II. LUTHER'S



## II. LUTHER's Religion not Protestant, in Eight Instances.

*Inst. 1.* **H**E ever maintain'd the *Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, and that to the Elements upon Consecration.* And his Followers, for their peculiar Defence of this Doctrine, are stil'd *Lutherans* by *Zuinglius, Calvin, the Church of England, &c.* who impugn the foresaid Doctrine.

*Inst. 2.* *Luther* also defended *Prayer to Saints*, for their *intercession* to God for us. Of which point he thus writeth; *De intercessione divorum, &c.* As to the Doctrine of *Intercession of Saints*, I hold with the whole Christian Church, and it is my judgment, that *Saints* ought to be honour'd and invocated by us. [ *Luth. in purg. quorund. Artic. & in epist. ad Georg. spatat.* ]

*Inst. 3.* He also taught the Doctrine of *Evangelical Counsels*; to wit, that a man might do more than he is commanded, as appears out of his Book, *De Assertionibus, Art. 30.*

*Inst. 4.* The Doctrine of *Purgatory* he taught; of which see *Tom. 1. Wittenberg. in resol. de Indulgentiis, Concl. 15. & in disp. Lipsica cum Eckio.* And upon this ground he is confessed by *Urbanus Regius* (a Protestant) to defend *Prayer for the Dead.* [ *In 1. par. operum formula caute loquend. cap. de Sanct. cultu.* ]

*Inst. 5.* *Luther* further taught, and approv'd the use of *Images in Churches*, as *Beza* witnesses. [ *In resp. ad art. Coloq. Mont. part. alt. in. præfat.* ]

*Inst.*

*Inst. 6. The indifferency of Communion under one, or both kinds, is allow'd by Luther, in these words, Quamvis pulchrum sit &c. Altho it were very seemly to use both the species, or forms, in the blessed Eucharist; and the Christ commanded nothing herein, as necessary, yet it were better to follow peace &c. than to contend about the forms. [ Luth. in epist. ad Bohemos. ]*

*Inst. 7. Concerning the making of the Sign of the Cross upon our Foreheads, Johannes Crevelius (a Lutheran) thus witnesseth, Cum imus cubitum, sive surgimus e lecto, cruce nos juxta Lutheri & aliorum piorum institutionem signamus: When we go to bed, or rise from thence, we sign our selves with the sign of the Cross, according to the advice of Luther and other pious men, [ In his Refutation Caremon. Missæ, printed at Magdeb. 1603. p. 118. ] And Johan. Maulius (Luther's Scholar) thus writes of Luther, Respondet Lutherus, signo crucis facto, Deus me tueatur; Luther answers, at the making the Sign of the Cross, God defend me. [ Loc. com. 7. pag. 636. ]*

*Inst. 8. Finally, to omit divers other points, (wherein Luther never dissented from the Church of Rome,) Luther ever maintain'd, that the Government of the Church is Monarchical, and neither Aristocratical nor Popular: of which point Luther thus writes; Cum Deus voluerit, &c. Seeing God would have one Catholick Church, throughout the whole World, it was needful, that one People, imo unum aliquem Patrem istius unius populi eligi, yea some one Father of this one People should be chosen, ad quem & suos posteros spectaret totus orbis, to whose care, and his Successors, the whole world should belong. [ In loc. com. class. 1. c. 37. p. 107. ]*

Thus much to shew, that Luther, after his Revolt from the Catholick Church, did still retain many Catholick Doctrines, that are denied by modern Protestants, and consequently was no true Protestant.



*REFLECTIONS in Answer to the Vindication of Martin Luther's Spirit, Printed at the Theater in Oxford.*

THE *Vindicator* of *Luther's Spirit* seems to have writ with the *same spirit*. His first Cavil is at the *Considerer's* Rule of trying the *spirits* of the Teachers of new Doctrines, *by their fruits*. And he is willing (p. 2.) to stand to this Test, and that *Luther's spirit* should be try'd by his *morals*; but yet he sees no necessity neither of his submitting to such a Rule (the reason is obvious, of which more afterwards,) and therefore he chuses rather to appeal to St. John, 1 Ep. 4. 2. *every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God*. But certainly such Confession must be fruitful of good Works, or else what differs it from that of the Devils. But be the sense of this Text as the *Vindicator* would have it, yet *Luther* gains nothing by it: For he that denies that *Jesus* is Consubstantial with the *Father*, *is not of God*. But this did *Luther*, as is evident from the Instance of his *hatred* to that Article of the Christian Faith.

Next, The *Vindicator* endeavours to clear *Luther* of the *Solifidean* Doctrine, contrary to *Luther's* own words cited by the *Considerer*, as also *Inst.* 8. in this Paper.

Thirdly, Concerning *Luther's* vilifying Vows, Acts of Mortification, Pennance, single Life, &c. before he makes any defence he puts the Question, why the *Considerer* in giving so long a List of *Luther's* Doctrines, slipt that of *Indulgences*? For the Answer of which the *Vindicator* is referr'd to the *Considerer's* Tract of *Pennances* and *Indulgences*, that for so many years has baffled the most Celebrated of the Church of *England*; and therefore may safely defy his less considerable Pen. As to the Charge against *Luther* concerning Vows, the *Vindicator* replies, that *Luther* was not utterly against them. But yet afterwards he pleads for the Lawfulness of *Luther's* breaking his Vows, without assuring us, that he could not by continuing in his Cloyster, and using the ordinary means of Prayer and Mortification, have kept them. That Text of *Scripture* urg'd by the *Vindicator*, *All men receive not this saying, Mat. 9. 1.* does not prove, that God denies this Gift to any, or that any ever fail'd

the attaining of it that sincerely endeavour'd after it: Tho the Church of *England* Version in favour of this loose opinion (to say no worse of it) has in this place corrupted the Original. And thereupon the *Vindicator* seems to applaud *Luther* for relinquishing his Habit, his Canonical Prayers, &c. for the sake of *Bora*, (a Prostitute Nun, a fit Mother of such a Reformation,) as incapable of Marriage as himself. "For how could he have the leisure and the retiredness of the Cloyster (says the *Vindicator*) to perform all those Acts of Devotion, when the Burthen of the Reformation [and *Bora*] lay upon his shoulders. But if I well remember, the *Vindicator's* killing Argument, that *Luther* might break his Vow and Marry, is, because *Costerus* says, 'Tis less sin for Priests to Fornicate than to Marry. Therefore for *Luther* to Marry was no sin. A wise Consequence! But suppose this Quotation out of *Costerus* to have its full force; yet if he held Fornication a mortal damnable sin, as certainly he did, neither Priests nor the *Vindicator* would be any gainers by it; for both he that fornicates, and he that marries after Vows, are equally liable to eternal Damnation. But if *Luther* could have liv'd contently, as he says he did whilst a Monk, (and nothing appears to shew he could not) what can be alleg'd in defence of his doubly wicked sacrilegious Marriage?

4. To the Objections of *Luther's* rejecting the Authority of the present Church, and the denying it to be a true Church, the *Vindicator* knows not what to answer. However, to blind the matter, something must be said, and therefore the Church which *Luther* condemn'd must be the *Court of Rome*. But then to the Question, which himself puts, concerning the *Visibility of the Church for many Ages*, even according to *Luther's* Note of it, viz. the true and sincere preaching of the Word, he gives you no other Answer than what might be expected from an ordinary Quaker; That in all that dark midnight of Popery (Midday is darkness to some sort of Creatures) which filled the Earth for so many Ages, there were still some Gleams of Light, some Witnesses that arose to give Testimony to the Truth, to protest against Innovations: But whether those Gleams, those Witnesses, were Lutherans, or Calvinists, or Zuinglians, or Cranmerians, or Parkerians, he knows not. They seem to me to have been an invisible people, and (like the Spanish Black-Bills in Oates's Plot) to have liv'd under ground; or at least the saying there were such people, may serve for



or a time to beguile the unwary, and to keep on foot and carry on the *holy Cheat*. But instead of a proof that they were indeed the Visible Church of Christ, he refers us to a testy saying of *Scaliger's*, that has nothing of Truth in it.

But the *Vindicator* seems much offended, that *Luther* should be charg'd with denying the Validity of the former Clergy's Ordination : Yet he does not reflect, that *Luther* argued no true Consecration of the Eucharist from the defect of Ordination, as being convinc'd of it by the Devils argument. And as for the Flourish he speaks of, 'tis his own, not *Luther's*. Nor doth *Luther's* proceeding in the Work of the Ministry prove, that he own'd his Mission from the preceding Church ; but rather that he look'd upon himself to have had an extraordinary Mission, or otherwise what Authority could he pretend ( and certainly so great an Apostle would do nothing without just Authority ) to Ordain and Commission others ? Of which in its proper place. To *Luther's* calling the Pope *Antichrist*, Bishops his *Apostles*, and Universities his *Lupanaria* ; the *Vindicator* seems to subscribe, and applaud him in it ; and I doubt not but he would contribute his Faggot towards the Burning of him in effigie. But yet this is an Error exploded by Learned Protestants, *Hammond*, *Thorndyke*, *Grotius*, and others ; and has been preach'd against in this University by much learned men than the *Vindicator*.

Here I must beg leave to digress with the *Vindicator*, to two gross mistakes of his, p.27. whereby he thinks he has given the Church of *Rome* a terrible blow. The first is, That to give an inferior sort of Cult or Respect to the Elements, is to worship them with Divine Worship ; which is false *ex terminis*, unless it be true, that an *inferior worship* is the *supreme*. The second mistake is, That for a Priest to operate the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ ( which Church-of-England Ministers pretend to do after their fashion ) is neither more nor less than to make God. So then to operate the presence of a thing is to make the thing. To operate, e. g. in Baptism the presence of the Holy Ghost is to make the Holy Ghost. And so also to occasion the presence of the *Vindicator* of *Luther* in the Divinity or Logick School, would make him a *Vindicator* of *Luther* ; which is utterly impossible.

5. To *Luther's* rejecting Councils, the *Vindicator* writes *pro* and *con* ; 1. That he did so, when ( in his private Judgment ) they went contrary to Scriptures ; and so ( says he ) do all the

*Reformed*; he might have added, and all Hereticks in the world, all of them preferring their *private interpretation* of Scripture to that of the Church: But secondly, *Luther* did not so, because *he never refus'd* (if we may believe his Defender) *to be concluded by the Authority of a Council legally summon'd*. The noise of his Adversaries (says the *Vindicator*) who were perpetually crying Councils and Canons, when they had nothing else to say for their Cause (and was not that enough?) might perhaps force out an expression or two from him, &c. He had fire in his temper, and a *German* bluntness, and upon these provocations might possibly strain a phrase with too great freedom. And what was the innocent freedom this *Reformer* took? It was only to asperse the most sacred and famous Councils that ever were, the Apostolical at *Jerusalem*, and the first *Nicene*, (submitted to by *Protestants* themselves). Arguing from the Injunction of the first, *to abstain from Blood and things strangled* (which was only Temporary) that it is lawful not to obey the Decrees of Councils. And saying of the second, That its Canons were Hay, Straw, Wood, Stubble; and particularly concerning the Third Canon of that Council, prohibiting the Clergy to have with them in their House any Women unless their Mother, Sister, Grandmother, or Aunt, *That he did not understand the Holy Ghost in this Council*. What? *Has the Holy Ghost nothing to do but to bind and burden its Ministers with impossible, dangerous, and unnecessary Laws?* And, lastly, he affirm'd, *That the Christian Doctrine receiv'd more Light from the Children's Catechism than all the Councils*. This one Text, *beware of false Prophets*, *Mat. 17. 15.* (says swaggering *Luther*) may suffice against the Authorities of all the Popes, Fathers, Councils, and Schoolmen, who attribute to Bishops and Ministers the sole power of Judging and Deciding Controversies. In the very Council of *Nice*, the best that ever was before or since, even then began they to make Laws and claim that power.--Wherefore since such an Error, and so great Sacrilege, has been able to prevail so long, *I will* (and command) *once for all, that those Sophisters hold their Prating, &c.* And is all this in a *Reformer* nothing else but *straining a phrase*; and so great a wickedness in him no sin?

6. The Arraignment of *Luther* for speaking contemptuously of the Fathers, the *Vindicator* says is a rank Calumny. But is it a Calumny to say he speaks contemptuously of the Fathers, who



who was not afraid to assert, In the Writings of every one of the Fathers how great Errors are there? how oft do they contradict themselves? who is there of them that does not very many times wrest the Scriptures? Is not that a Contempt of the Fathers, to call the *Thomists* Blockheads, for proving the *Sacrifice of the Mass* by a multitude of the Fathers, and ancient Custom? And to averr, That if there be nothing to be reply'd in answer to the Fathers, better however to deny all the Fathers than grant the Mass to be a Sacrifice? What *Luther* drolls upon the Fathers in his Table-talk will not pass with the *Vindicator* to have been in earnest, because (I suppose) he thinks it was in his Cups. But it is strange, that his serious preferring *Melancthon* before all the Fathers, should by the *Vindicator* be call'd not an affront or contempt against the Fathers, but a complement to *Melancthon*? And yet some of the Church of *England*, that think themselves Learned, have been heard to say, That they do not see why *Dr. Tillotson*, *Dr. Stillingfleet*, *Dr. Tenison*, *Dr. Sherlock*, &c. may not pass for Fathers of as good Authority in the Church, as *St. Ambrose*, *St. Austin*, &c.

7. To the Proof of *Luther's* setting up his own Authority against the Church, and maintaining his own Doctrines as infallible, nothing is answer'd. The instance which the *Considerer* gives, is the Doctrine of *Consubstantiation*, wherein *Luther* pretends Certainty and Revelation in God's Word. Could any man have persuaded me (says *Luther Epist. ad Argent.*) there was nothing but Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, he had much oblig'd me. For being in great perplexity, I took great pains in Discussing the point; I endeavour'd with all my might to extricate and free my self, as well perceiving I should thereby very much incommode the Papacy. But I see I am caught, there is no way of escaping left me: For the words of the Evangelists [This is my Body, &c.] are too plain and clear to be forc'd to any other meaning. It is evident, that in this Doctrine *Luther* was neither *Catholick*, nor Church of *England Protestant*. But yet so much a *Catholick* he was, as to hold the real presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord in the Sacrament. Being forc'd to it (as himself Confesses) by the words of Scripture. But how one that holds a Doctrine so contradictory to the sense and reason of a Church of *England* man, should deserve the extravagant Encomiums of the *Vindicator*, I cannot understand.

8. To *Luther's* altering the publick Liturgy, and reforming the Service of the *Maß*, the *Vindicator* replies in great fury, that the *Considerer* has mistaken *Hospinian*. But yet he saves me the labour of examining the Quotation, and rectifying the Folio, by his yeilding the cause. For he confesses, that *Luther* was deputed to throw out all that Part of the Service of the *Maß* that made the Sacrament a Sacrifice. And what is throwing out, but Altering and Reforming the Service of the *Maß*? But then he says, *Luther* did not impose his Form as obligatory. Not as obligatory; *si quid melius illis revelatum fuerit*, if any new Revelation could supply them with a better. But can any one say, he did not impose it as obligatory, before and instead of the ancient Form of the Church? Or otherwise what signified his writing a Book for the abolishing the most ancient and venerable Service of the *Maß*?

To *Luther's* taking upon him the Authority of Ordaining Bishops and Ministers, the *Vindicator* admits the fact; but says, it was done not out of choice, but necessity. A worthy Answer! What necessity was there? Were there no Bishops in *Germany* at that time? Or does it any where appear, that ever the Church allow'd of any such necessity? Yes, the *Vindicator* presents us with a well known passage of *St. Austin*, *In Alexandria & per totum Ægyptum, Si desit Episcopus consecrat Presbyter*. This passage is well known not to be *St. Austin's*, but the words of another Author, (see *St. Austin's Works*, *Qu. de utroque Test.* 101.) Nor does the word *Consecrat* signifie Ordaining: The *Presbyters* in *Ægypt*, or any other place, being never permitted to Ordain upon any pretence whatsoever. But *Consecrat* here may signifie the same with *Consignat*; and by this is meant Consecration of *Chrism*, which tho proper to a *Bishop*, yet, it seems, in *Ægypt* was done by *Presbyters* in the *Bishop's* absence. But it was not for the *Vindicator's* purpose to give the true sence of this passage: For if the *Presbyterian* Ordination fails, where will the Church of *England* find Refuge, when her own Ordination shall be call'd in Question?

10. To *Luther's* sentencing the Canon-Law, consisting of the Decrees of Councils and Popes, to the Fire, and Burning them in a solemn Assembly of the University of *Wirttemberg*, the *Vindicator* owns the fact to be true. But he denies that it was done upon *Luther's* own Authority: For he had a Commission as a Preacher



Preacher of God's Word; and he had taken an Oath at his going out Doctor, to confound as much as in him lay all pernicious Doctrines. A very solid Defence! *Luther* it seems did pass sentence upon the Decrees of Councils, &c. for the confounding Doctrines which in his own private Judgment he thought pernicious: But he did it as a Preacher of God's Word, and a Doctor, not as the Arch-Reformer *Martin Luther*. But the *Vindicator* distrusting this Argument, says, *Luther* had other motives. And what were those? His Books had been solemnly burnt at *Rome* as Heretical: His own people were startled at it; so that he was forc't boldly to make Reprisals, to buoy up his Followers courage. A fair Concession. The *Church* Censur'd *Luther's* Books as Heretical, *Luther* returns the Censure upon the *Church*, and Condemns her Decrees as pernicious. And yet this in a *Reformer* was no Usurping an Authority, but only declaring his Opinion as the Scholars did at the *Oxon* Decree against *Bellarmin*, and other *Jesuits*, without knowing or being able to shew, that those Writers held any such pernicious Tenets.

II. To *Luther's* pronouncing *Anathema's*, and Excommunicating the *Reform'd* that dissented from him, the *Vindicator* replies in a Question, *Is there no difference between a Judicial Anathema, and a Wish of Execration?* So that *Luther* might Curse, but not Anathematize his Dissenting Brethren. The *Monks*, says he, writ upon their *MSS. Anathema* to all that should violate them. I suppose he means by *MSS.* the Registers of Founders Statutes, and Donations belonging to Monasteries: The weight and effects of which Curses (if we may believe *Reform'd* Writers themselves) are both felt and dreaded to this very day. But the *Vindicator* after three or four unhandson Sarcasms, pretends to prove his point from the *Considerer's* own words, [*Luther* requir'd not Conformity to his Doctrines out of any Authority he claim'd to impose them, which Authority he renounc't;] Here the *Vindicator* leaves off in the middle of a sentence very politicly, and like a *Reform'd Controvertist*, lest the other end should sting him. The sentence goes on [but yet (which is somewhat more) he required a Conformity to his Doctrines from a Certainty of Divine Truth which he pretended to be in them] And so the Obedience he refus'd as a Magistrate, he claim'd as an Oracle; and would have his own pretended *Apostolical certainty of Doctrine* set up instead of the *Church's* Authority; and those

those that would not submit, must expect his *Apostolical Censures*; notwithstanding it was easie for Dissenters to produce more reasons for leaving him, than he could for leaving the Church.

Yet this *Certainty of Doctrine* the *Vindicator* calls *Protestant Certainty*, and is much in love with it, and wonders the *Considerer* should not understand it; I guess he means, when one of so narrow a capacity as himself fully comprehends it. But I dare challenge him and all his Party, to shew me which of the Protestant Churches is the true, wherein this pretended Certainty of Doctrine may be found. A little after, the *Vindicator* compares *Luther's* Condemning his Brethren the *Sacramentarians*, and their returning the Censure (notwithstanding the great difference between them in the point of the *Real Presence*) to the feud of *Hierom* and *Ruffinus*, of *Epiphanius* and *Chrysostom*, of *Victor* and the *Greek Bishops*, of *Paul* and *Barnabas*. The very recital of this absurd passage is a sufficient Reflection.

12. *Luther's* Evil-speaking (so ill becoming an Apostle) the *Vindicator* does not undertake to defend; but confesses it to be such as neither Friends nor Enemies could approve. However he would have *Luther's* way of Writing to be the Humour of the Age. But why should then the *Tigurine Divines* blame his *Confessio Parva*? That it was full-fraught with Nick-names, as *Devil*, &c. and other Unchristian terms of Reproach; so cramm'd with lewd, nasty, ribaldry stuff; so full of anger, maliciousness, fury, and madness, that none (that were not as mad as *Luther* himself) could read it without astonishment at so unfortunate and unheard-of an Example, &c. And another *Zuinglian* said, That God for *Luther's* pride had taken from him the good Spirit, and given him a Lying one in it's stead. And does not the whole current of Writers of his own time, in a manner, say the same thing? For a Gentleman to write a scurrilous Satyr (even upon an Heretick) may be a great fault; but for an Apostle to be an Evil-speaker, a Blasphemer of Kings, of the whole Catholick Church, and of God Almighty himself, is certainly an unpardonable Crime.

The *Considerer* observes of *Calvin* (another principal Reformer) that he was of the same Spirit with *Martin Luther*, and gave as ill Language where he ow'd submission and obedience. This the *Vindicator* calls stepping out of the way, and thinks himself not oblig'd



oblig'd to take notice of it, because perhaps less able to defend him than *Luther*. In the same page the *Vindicator* takes up the *Considerer*, for saying *St. Peter's* Example not Doctrine was false; and will have *St. Peter's* Doctrine to have been false; and he gives you this reason for it, *Elymas* withstood *Paul*, *Alexander* withstood *Paul*, and they err'd in Doctrine, therefore *St. Peter* Err'd in Doctrine. Why so? because *Paul* withstood him, and it is highly probable that he withstood *Paul* again, and so became an *Elymas*. Good God! that such a blasphemous Argumentation should be Licens'd in a Christian University. But I cease my wonder, when I hear that lately a whole Sermon was Preach'd before the University against this great Apostle, and pass'd Uncensur'd.

13. Proceed we next to *Luther's* famous Disputation with the Devil. *Luther* confesses it. The *Vindicator* will have it to have been either a Dream or a strong Temptation. But which should know best, *Luther* or the *Vindicator*? Mr. *Walsingham*, in King *James's* time, was convinc'd by it. He went to the King, as Head of the Church, to be satisfied: The King sent him to the Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and he turn'd him over to his Chaplain Dr. *Covel* for satisfaction, who had nothing to Reply, but what Confirm'd this Gentleman in the belief of this story of *Luther* [and of the Devil's being the Author of the Reformation]. His Book call'd *His Search*, then Baff'd the whole Church of *England*, and remains unanswer'd to this very day. This Argument likewise convinc'd the Ingenious Mr. *Chillingworth*; and his Reply to it after his Lapse, says only, That for ought he knew it might be a Melancholy Dream, (and it might not). No force at all of an Argument in this; as indeed in none of his Replies to his own Motives. Which made the Learned Protestants say, That *Chillingworth* had better have sleighted and contemn'd his Motives, than to have return'd such weak Answers to them as were not able to bring his own Old Mother back again to the Church of *England*. To return to the *Vindicator*: Afterwards he seems to own the Disputation, and endeavours to vindicate the Devil's Arguments, as being the same that are now used by the Reformers. The Devil's first Argument; That in the Church (of which *Luther* then profess'd himself a Member) there was no true Faith, or knowledge of Christ, no true Priesthood; the *Vindicator* passes by, as knowing that the Learned Protestants have left the Devil in this point, and for him to appear on his side alone, would look

ridiculous to his own Party. The Devils second\*Argument was That according to Christ's Institution the Priest ought not to Celebrate the Blessed Sacrament alone, as Luther had done for many years; The Considerer's Answer is solid, and not touch'd by the *Vindicator*. Luther might have answer'd, That his partaking it alone was not his fault: Nor yet the fault of others, who were no way engag'd to Receive it with him so often as he Offer'd it. But this did not hinder, that he might not partake himself, when others did not. Nor was he oblig'd by any Precept of our Lord, to forbear either Partaking or Offering, tho there were none to Communicate with him. And as for the sense of those Texts of Scripture urg'd by Satan (and now by his *Vindicator*) he was to adhere, not to Satan's, or his Own, but the Church's Judgment thereon. And the Church always judg'd (as is manifest from her practice) that the Consecrator might partake alone when no others presented themselves. The Devil goes on to object, That Luther (in his publick *Mass*) did not give the Sacrament entire (because not in both kinds) to the People. The Considerer replies, That Luther might have answer'd the Devil, as the Church doth her Adversaries, That there is no Precept of our Lord's commanding a necessary receiving in both kinds. Neither modern nor ancient Church so interpreting the words of Institution; the ancient Church frequently giving the *Eucharist* to Sick, and to Absents from the publick Service, only in one kind; holding that she Offended herein against no Command of our Lord. To this the *Vindicator* answers, That the Bishop of *Meaux* on this subject says the clear contrary. But then he must say it contrary to the Fathers (St. *Dionysius* in the second Age, *Eccl. Hier. c. ult. prope finem*. Tertul. l. ad Uxor. St. *Cypr. Serm. de Lapsis* n. 10. in the third Age. St. *Ambr. Orat. de vita Satyr. & Eust.* in the Fourth Age. In the fifth, St. *Austin l. adv. Julian. Pelag. c. 4. prope finem*. & *Torn. 2. Ep. 106. post medium*.) Lest therefore the *Vindicator* should seem to have said nothing, he advances a stale Objection, many times urg'd, and as often answer'd. I should perhaps have pass'd it by, had it not been lately vigorously press'd by some of the *Oxford Divines* to a serious Gentleman for the Confirming him in the Church of *England*. The Objection pretends, that Communion in one kind was Decreed in a Council with a *non obstante* to the Custom of the Primitive Church. The Decree of the Council, as



to this point, Defines, That altho Christ Instituted this venerable Sacrament, and administred to his Disciples in both the *species* of Bread and Wine, and that after Supper, *tamen hoc non obstante*, yet notwithstanding such Institution, and administring in both kinds; and that after Supper, yet the Church hath and doth Observe and Command, That this Sacrament may not be Celebrated after Supper, nor be receiv'd by any that are not fasting, unless in such cases of Necessity allow'd of by the Church. And in like manner, That altho in the Primitive Church this Sacrament was receiv'd by the Faithful under both kinds, yet for the avoiding some Hazards and Scandals, this (the present) Custom was upon good reason introduc'd, of Consecrating under both kinds, and the Laities Communicating under the *species* of Bread only; it being firmly to be believ'd, and no way to be doubted, but that the whole Body and Blood of Christ is truly contain'd under either *species*, as well that of Bread as that of Wine. All sides grant, that our Saviour Instituted in both kinds, and that he did it after Supper; but where does it appear, that he commanded all should receive in both kinds, and that they should receive after Supper? And yet if he in his words of Institution commanded the one, he also commanded the other; for both are equally contain'd in those words. And if the Church can Interpret and Command (as also the Church of *England* does) that people should communicate fasting, why may she not also Interpret and Command, that people shall receive in one kind only? Thus much of this fraud. But is it not a shame, that such falsities should be Authoriz'd by an University that was Founded for the defence of Truth, and the increase of God Almighty's Church; and not for deluding of unwary Souls.

The Devil's next Objection against *Luther's* being a Priest is, That the Mind and Institution of Christ was, That other Christians also should communicate in this Sacrament; but *Luther* was Ordain'd not to give the Sacrament to others, but to Offer Sacrifice. The *Considerer* replies, That according to this argument, neither would the Priest have Authority to give the Sacrament to himself. And besides, that *Sacrificare* in the Church's sense, takes in also the distributing part. Here the *Vindicator* pretends, that it is not the Church's sense; and he takes his argument from the Catechism of the Council of *Trent* (*Cap. de Euch. §. 75.*) There (says he) the Eucharist is said to

le Instituted upon a double account; the one, that it might be a spiritual Food for our Souls; the other, that it might be a Sacrifice for our Sins. From whence he infers, that certainly the Ministering the Eucharist to the people belongs to it as it is the Food of our Souls; and therefore as a Sacrament, not as a Sacrifice. The Church in this place holds, that it is Ministered to the people as a Sacrament, but does she not also hold, that it is Offer'd to God Almighty as a Sacrifice first, and afterwards distributed as a Sacrament? And does not the word *Sacrificare* include both? The *Vindicator* would have baffl'd himself, if he had but put down the remainder of the Paragraph; which expressly explicates the Eucharist's being both a Sacrifice and a Sacrament, by its Figure and Type the Paschal Lamb, that being first Offer'd by the Children of *Israel* as a Sacrifice, and then Eaten as a Sacrament. But for a fuller account of the Church's sense, the *Vindicator* is referr'd to her Decrees, where he will find, that Priests have power given them of Consecrating, Offering, and Distributing the Body and Blood of Christ, as also to Remit and Retain Sins, to Bless, Govern, Preach, Baptize, &c. And is not all this more than to Offer Sacrifice? In this point the *Devil* and the *Vindicator* are at odds. The *Devil* urges the nullity of *Luther's* Orders, upon the account of his being a *Sacrificing Priest*. The *Vindicator* distinguishes upon him, That tho' the Form (of making him a *Sacrificing Priest*) should be a little defective, yet where the Church Intends to convey Orders, there they are actually convey'd; and his being made a *Sacrificing Priest* did not prejudice *Luther's* Orders at all. That is to say, he might be a *Sacrificing Priest*, and a *not-Sacrificing Priest*, by the same Form. Had he also, by the same Form, a new Authority given him of beginning a new Ordination, that should be opposite to that of the whole preceding Church? These are the *Goliath-Arguments* in which the *Vindicator* exposes himself and his Party to defie the Church of God.

The *Devil* proceeds to another Objection against *Luther's* Orders, His using the Mass as a Sacrifice Propitiatory for Sins, contrary to Christ's Institution. The *Vindicator* closes with him, and waving the word Propitiatory, puts the Question, Whether it be truly a Sacrifice? In which he might have satisfied himself out of any of the Catholick Writers, who would have told him, that the Mass is a true, proper, unbloody Propitiatory  
SACRIFICE



**Sacrifice for Sins** ; and that according to Christ's Institution, who at his last Supper gave his Body for his Disciples, Offering it up first to God as a Sacrifice, before he gave it to them as a Sacrament: *This is my Body which is given ( to God ) for you.* And the ancient Fathers are full of Testimonies to this purpose. See *Bell.* The *Vindicator* seems not to have read the Fathers, and therefore is advis'd to consult them before he Replies, and take great care how he denies the Daily Sacrifice of the Church, and the Christians only Propitiatory Sacrifice for Sins.

13. The *Vindicator* takes no further notice of *Luther's Conference*: But is very angry, that the *Considerer* should meddle with his Friend *Zuinglius*, another principal Reformer ; and that he should say of him, that he also had a Visit from an Evil Spirit, that help'd him to an Interpretation of *Hoc est Corpus meum*, for the establishing his *Virtual Presence* ; and that *Zuinglius* confess'd it, with this asseveration, *vera narro adeoque vera, &c. What I tell you is true, nay so true, tho I would have conceal'd it, yet my Conscience forc'd me to utter what the Lord would have me impart, notwithstanding the many Scoffs and Jeers to which I know I shall expose my self thereby, &c.* And lastly, that *Luther* said of it, *That it was as clear as the Sun at Noon-day, that the Zuinglian Heresie was nothing else but the Mockery of the Devil, who had sham'd Zuinglius with a sorry but crafty Interpretation.* This Apparition to *Zuinglius* the *Vindicator* calls an ordinary Dream, as if he himself had had many such. But does he not at the same time deny the Testimonies of *Zuinglius* and *Luther* ? And he that will give the Lye to his own Party, even those he pretends to Vindicate, what Arguments can be sufficient to convince him ! If such a clear Discovery of the variety and subtilty of *Satan's* temptations and wiles, as the *Considerer*, consonant to the Word of God, has made, ( which all good men thankfully receive ), is therefore rejected, because it condemns the principal Reformers out of their own Works and Confessions, what wise man ( that consults his eternal good ) will not rather abominate such Reformers than deny the Truth.

14. To the Resemblance of *Luther's Change of Religion* in several particulars with that of *Mahomet's*, the *Vindicator* replies, That he was almost tempted to return the kindness with a Parallel between *some body* and *Judas*. Intimating, that every one that leaves the Church of *England*, and becomes a *Catholic*,

lick, must be a *Judas*. And consequently, that the Greatest and most Excellent Person in the Nation must be so too, and yet at the same time remain the Supreme Head of the Church of *England*. But he not daring to speak out what he meant by *somebody*, chuses rather to asperse Pope *Boniface*, as if he had begun a new Kingdom in the Church about fifteen years before *Mahomet*. For the proof of which he gives us no Argument, and yet he would have us believe it; tho at the same time Demonstration on our side will not convince Protestants of *Luther's* beginning a new Kingdom. As to the Book he mentions, call'd *Turco-Papismus*, if he means by it, that *Roman Catholicks* are *Turks*, I suppose the Church of *England* will not bear him out in it. Unless such as lamented the taking of *Buda*, and wish'd less prosperous success to the Christian Arms. But upon the whole matter the *Vindicator* thinks the Parallel childish, and the *Considerer* not skill'd in hitting features. Let us see then: Did not *Luther* resemble *Mahomet* in those particulars urg'd by the *Considerer*? As, 1. In rejecting the Sense and Exposition of Scripture receiv'd in former times. This Innovator urging, that the Sense and Meaning of the Scriptures, as the other that the Words and Writings thereof, were falsified. And was it not *Luther* that said, *That he scorn'd to submit himself or his Doctrine to the Judgment of Bishops* (the Fathers of the Church), and *that the World had been long enough guilty of such a foolish Humility*? And did *Mahomet* ever say any thing more rebellious? 2. Did not *Luther* resemble *Mahomet* in the manner of his Coming. Neither of them working Miracles, yet pretending to an extraordinary Authority in Reforming the World. Both of them destitute of the Virtues of the Holy Spirit, *temperance, meekness, &c.* propagating their Principles, the one by his Railing Tongue, the other by his Sword. Some of *Luther's* own Brood said of him, *That he had much of the Evil Spirit in all his Reproofs, very little of the meek amicable Spirit of God*. Even his Friend *Melancthon* said little less, when he wrote to *Calvin*, *That for twenty years he had expected Banishment from Luther, upon the account of some difference between them, concerning the Bread-Worship of some of Luther's Followers*. 3. Did not *Luther* resemble *Mahomet* in Sensuality, and the indulging his Appetites; pleading much for the Necessity of Marriage; scouting the Councils of Perfection and of a stricter Life, as Celibacy, Monastical



nastical Poverty, Obedience, &c. Dispensing with his own Vows. The *Vindicator's* Argument, pag. 23. That *Luther* might Dispence with his own Vows without having recourse to the Judgment of the Church is *new Divinity*; for tho it be true, that no Power in the Church can Dispense where the cause is not just, yet it is as true, that the *Votary* (v.g. *Mart. Luther*) is incapable of judging of the justness of the cause, or taking upon him Authority of Dispensing in his own case. And therefore the Reasons that *Luther* and his *Vindicator* seem to offer, that his Vow was not binding, ought to have been weigh'd in the Sanctuary, and have pass'd the Judgment of the Church: His own private thinking his Vows null not being sufficient to make them so, unless his pretended extraordinary Mission could also give him an extraordinary power of Dispensation. The *Vindicator's* darling reason of *Luther's* picking out *Bora*, for the making the President he was going to set the more conspicuous, and the declaring openly, that the Quarrel between him and Rome was irreconcilable, is the publishing his own and *Luther's* shame. And what he says against *Celibacy* (one of our Lord's Counsels of Perfection) that many that made profession of it liv'd wicked lives, may as fitly be apply'd against Matrimony (one of the Holy Sacraments), and *Sodom* and *Gomorrhah* as easily there be found (for I do not read that any in those Cities profess'd a single Life), and yet both *Celibacy* and *Matrimony* remain Holy Institutions in the Church of Christ for bringing Souls to Heaven. 4. Did not *Luther* resemble *Mahomet* in his attempting to degrade the formerly receiv'd Head of the Church upon Earth, as *Mahomet* did the Head thereof in Heaven; pronouncing the Chief Pastor of Christ's Flock *Antichrist*, and the Church of God his *Sponse*; applying to him all the Marks of that great false Prophet, whose steps *Luther* himself notoriously follow'd. The *Considerer* gives more Instances of the Parallel: But I remember what the *Vindicator* answers to the *Considerer's* pressing *Luther's* preferring *Turcism* to *Christianity*, the *Alcoran* to the *Bible*, and *Mahomet* to *Christ*, That here his fancy had made a Gyant of a Windmill. The *Considerer* had no thought of Windmills, but the *Vindicator* it seems had, which made him slip (as he phrases it) from one Paragraph to another, without answering the Arguments of any of them.

Lastly,

Lastly, To the *Considerer's* Sentence upon *Martin Luther*, according to our Saviour's Rule, (*by their fruits you shall know them*) That it was easie to discern this Person (*Martin Luther*) not to have been possess'd with the Good, but the Bad Spirit; the *Vindicator* seems to answer, That one that teacheth true Doctrine may be a bad man; and that the Doctrine of the Apostles and the Primitive Church is ne'r the worse for such men's Preaching it. But he should have observ'd, That *Luther* was no ordinary Preacher, but the Beginner of a new Church; and therefore his Life should have been like that of the *Apostles*. To prove that it was so, the *Vindicator* parallels him with St. Paul, p. 25. in *wrestling against Principalities and Powers*, &c. there enumerating the greatest part of that Apostles Virtues; adding, I could not forbear setting down this Panoply of St. Paul, wherewith *Luther* compleatly arm'd himself in his Spiritual Warfare; and I do not know whether this Description belongs so justly to a man as him since the days of the Apostles. And in the Conclusion of his Book he is more extravagant in the Praise of this monstrous Reformer. Such absurdities need no Reflections. The few Instances given in this Paper, more largely insisted on by the Judicious *Considerer*, are I think sufficient to satisfy any unprejudic'd Reader, That *Luther* was not a St. Paul, or indeed any Saint, or good Christian; but on the contrary, a Sacrilegious, Insolent Opposer of the Catholick Religion, that under the shew of Reformation divided the Church of Christ.

If therefore what is said in the *Considerations of the Spirit* upon *Martin Luther* be true, the Church of England, in her Vindicating and Abetting so notorious a *Schismatick*, in the very Act of Separating himself from the Whole, True, Visible, Hierarchical Church of Christ, must be *Schismatical*. And that what is said in the *Considerations*, &c. is true, evidently appears from the preceding *Reflections*; wherein is briefly and plainly shew'd That the *Oxford Vindicator* has prov'd nothing to the contrary.



cor-  
em),  
ber )  
irit,  
Do-  
ttles  
ach-  
ordi-  
ere-  
To  
Paul,  
enu-  
ould  
with  
and  
any  
clu-  
this  
The  
a by  
un-  
deed  
egi-  
the

it of  
ndi-  
Act  
chi-  
it is  
rom  
w'n,  
ry.